

**BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

Order Instituting Rulemaking to Implement  
the California Renewables Portfolio Standard  
Program.

Rulemaking 04-04-026  
(Filed April 22, 2004)

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGES' RULING  
REGARDING PG&E'S MOTION FOR ORDER  
SHORTENING TIME FOR RESPONSE TO SEVEN DAYS**

On May 15, 2006, Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E) moved for leave to supplement its comments on reporting and compliance issues, and concurrently submitted "Supplement to Comments of Pacific Gas and Electric Company (U 39-E) on Reporting and Compliance Issues" (Supplement). PG&E asserts that information in its Supplement should be considered by the Commission when the Commission reaches a decision on the 2006 Renewable Portfolio Standards (RPS) Plans. The draft decision on the 2006 RPS Plans is on the Commission's May 25, 2006 agenda.

PG&E points out responses to motions must be filed and served within 15 days of the date of the motion, pursuant to Rule 45(f) of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (Rules). PG&E says this would make responses to the May 15, 2006 motion due by May 30, 2006. PG&E notes that the Commission or Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) may rule on a motion before responses have been filed, but believes interested parties may wish to be heard on the motion. As a result, on May 15, 2006, PG&E also moved for an order shortening time for response to seven days. PG&E seeks reduction from 15 to 7 days, making responses due by May 22, 2006.

PG&E is correct that the Commission or ALJ may rule on a motion before responses have been filed. (Rule 45(h).) It is also true that interested parties need not wait until the last day permitted by the Rules to file and serve a response. It is reasonable to believe that parties interested in responding to PG&E's motion for leave to file its Supplement will file and serve responses sooner than the fifteenth day, recognizing the schedule for the Commission's consideration of this matter. Parties know that the 2006 RPS Plan decision is on the Commission's May 25, 2006 agenda. No party has indicated either support or opposition for shortening the time to respond.

Therefore, there is no apparent need to grant, or interest in the granting of, PG&E's motion to shorten time. A party with an interest in responding to PG&E's May 15, 2006 motion for leave to file its Supplement may do so at any time within the 15 days permitted in the Rules. A party with such interest should file its response as soon as possible. Parties should also note that a ruling on PG&E's motion to file its Supplement may be issued before May 25, 2006. Each party should take this into account in determining when to file its response.

**IT IS RULED** that the May 15, 2006 motion of Pacific Gas and Electric Company for an order shortening time for response to seven days is denied.

Dated May 18, 2006, at San Francisco, California.

/s/ BURTON W. MATTSON

Burton W. Mattson  
Administrative Law Judge

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I certify that I have by mail this day served a true copy of the original attached Administrative Law Judges' Ruling Regarding PG&E's Motion for Order Shortening Time for Response to Seven Days on all parties of record in this proceeding or their attorneys of record.

Dated May 18, 2006, at San Francisco, California.

/s/ JOYCE TOM

Joyce Tom

**N O T I C E**

Parties should notify the Process Office, Public Utilities Commission, 505 Van Ness Avenue, Room 2000, San Francisco, CA 94102, of any change of address to insure that they continue to receive documents. You must indicate the proceeding number on the service list on which your name appears.